

**ADMINISTRATIVE**  
**INTERNAL USE ONLY****A PROPOSAL****CAREER SYSTEMS FOR CLERICALS**

1. When PASG studied the problems of creating a career system for the Agency, it was very conscious of the limited resources that were available to provide the staff work, staff the panels, provide the counseling, and monitor the operations of the system. Subsequently, many advisory groups, and even individual employees wrote papers advocating that some kind of systematic career management program be established for clerical employees. It became apparent that many signals were being directed toward management attesting to the desire from our employees that the Agency deliver on what it has stated an employee might expect from his (her) Career Service. The DDO has now raised this issue in the context of proposals for a secretarial career system. A look at the existing systems for clericals in general and secretaries in particular reveals significant differences in approach. In very general terms, the DDI and the DDS&T rely upon supervisors for the appropriate recommendations with respect to clericals. (There are exceptions in a few offices which rely on panels and boards.) The DDM&S is moving into a system wherein panels are evaluating personnel beginning with grade GS-07. In the DDO, the panel that reviews Category C employees is responsible for sub-category C-3, which covers the more senior secretarial personnel.

2. The referenced memo raises two major issues and makes, in addition, a number of specific suggestions. The two issues are:

- (a) Should the Agency differentiate between senior secretaries and other clericals in the provision of career service functions?
- (b) Should a Career Service for any type of clerical personnel be Agency-wide, in contrast to the rest of the Career System?

**ADMINISTRATIVE**  
**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

3. Some data on clericals are pertinent to these considerations. In the Agency's classification system, secretaries are a subset (58% of the total) of the larger clerical classification. The clericals--who are 30% of our employees--have many interesting characteristics--a high percentage of women (78%), a major share of the total employment of women in the Agency (71%), a high attrition rate (GS-07 and below - 22%; GS-08 and above - 14%), a low share of college graduates (7%), and a high share of the blacks employed. The average grade for the clericals is GS-06. Only one in 50 is GS-10 or higher; so the career prospects for clericals are not bright unless they can make the transition into semi-professional or professional status. Clericals now supply nearly 25% of the accessions to the professional ranks but this transition is made only by 50-70 a year. Based on these facts, to look at the senior secretaries alone would be to ignore some of the more crucial aspects of personnel management for the major occupational groups employing most of our women and most of our blacks. An effective personnel system for clerical employees should directly support accomplishment of major objectives with respect to EEO, other minorities and women.

4. In viewing the choice of Agency-level versus (present) Career Service-level review for clerical personnel, two major considerations apply. The first is that we must recognize the existence of a joint problem of establishing equitable personnel policies and utilizing people more effectively. Both are responsibilities assigned by the PASG Report to the Career Services, which incorporate at their senior levels both the personnel and management functions. This key decision has already been made. To superimpose on the five Career Services an Agency-wide system for a major occupational group would create obstacles to accomplishment of major personnel objectives. The second major consideration is the need to facilitate the career progression from clerical ranks into semi-professional and professional ranks, a task which would become much more difficult if a secretarial/clerical career service were divorced from the other Career Services. It will be important to provide more adequate preparation for this kind of transition.

5. Despite the logic that seems to argue in favor of solving the problem of providing a career system for clericals within the present Career Services, there is still a strong pressure for an independent Service. Why? The first obvious answer is that there is skepticism about the ability of the present Career Services to do a meaningful job. Two Career Services with a strong professional reputation rely almost exclusively upon the supervisors in all matters involving clericals. The other Career Services are only just beginning to launch new procedures that will affect the clericals. A second factor is the attitude among the employees of favoring an open Agency with relatively free movement from one component to another; they are not as familiar as the managers with the reasons inhibiting this. A third factor applies particularly to those groups aspiring to quasi-professional

**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

status, such as the senior secretaries; for them a unique Agency-level career service would be a clear signal of prestige and highest level recognition. If responsibility for clericals is left with the present Career Services, it is very important that they make a meaningful effort to address the problems, survey perceptions and attitudes, and get employee participation wherever possible.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

\* Assign the responsibility for clericals to the existing Career Services. (Action: Management Committee)

\* The Career Services at the earliest possible moment should review their organization and procedures for the evaluation, counseling, assignment, and promotion of secretaries and clerical personnel. (Action: Career Services)

\* An Office Employee Advisory Committee should be established at the Agency level along lines similar to the Management Advisory Group. It should provide management a channel for the views of the secretaries and other clerical personnel, provide them recognition, and provide them a means of reviewing and assessing the organization and procedures being practiced within the Career Services. (Action: Secretary, Management Committee)

\* The Career Services should provide for surveys of the attitudes of clerical personnel with respect to the operation of the Career System. (Action: Career Services and PSS/OMS)

6. Fair system of competing for job vacancies. Advisory groups within the Directorates and OP have highlighted the importance of establishing some such system. It is recorded that many secretaries feel that there are inequities in the way the very limited number of senior positions are filled. Though they often express a preference for a system of open vacancy notices, such a system would work only if accompanied by some definite system for defining "eligibles"; otherwise, each vacancy notice produces a flood of applicants who must be screened at a great cost after which the disappointed applicants become disillusioned. In addition, an open notice system tends to undo achievement of the desired goal of purposefully developing the successors to some jobs.

7. Some elements that would constitute a "fair" system are: (a) objective determination of eligibility for promotion or reassignment; (b) selection of candidates from an appropriate "field of consideration"; and, (c) selection of the nominee to fill the vacancy only from the roster of eligible candidates. The eligibility is most fairly determined through some panel system. (This is discussed in a following paragraph.) The selection of the appropriate field of consideration should relate to whether or not enough qualified candi-

~~ADMINISTRATIVE~~**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

dates are available within the career sub-group; if not enough are available, a notice may be circulated to additional career sub-groups (other offices) who may have qualified candidates. No candidates are to be considered who have not been designated by their panels as eligible by virtue of performance or established basis for a reassignment. A potential candidate should be notified and may request not to be considered; this is not a directed assignment system.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

\* Eligibility for promotion or reassignment should be determined by panel evaluation. (Action: Career Services)

\* Only eligible candidates are to be considered for filling vacancies. (Action: Career Services)

\* If not enough eligible candidates are available within a career sub-group (Office), a vacancy notice should be circulated to other sub-groups. (Action: Career Services)

\* The nominee to fill the vacancy must be from the roster of eligible candidates. (Action: Career Services)

8. Evaluation system. The evaluation system is at the heart of the career system and determines the effectiveness of promotion and placement policy. If the evaluations are to provide the necessary basis, there must be some common guidelines so that evaluations have equivalent meanings between different components. The person who knows most about the secretary's performance is her supervisor, but he may have little basis to compare her with others except in terms of her predecessors. Some supervisors would tend to rate high, some low. Her peers may know her reputation, but may be less able than the supervisor to rate her performance against her assigned duties. Accordingly, a panel would have to rely somewhat upon her supervisor's evaluation and on that of her peers. Some secretarial skills are testable, so test scores might be made a matter of the record; hopes for promotion would provide some incentive for updating tests. Evaluation should also consider training and courses taken.

9. By considering the objective record of performance, test scores, courses taken, and the employee's preferences with respect to assignment and additional training, the panel has useful additional information to add to the supervisor's evaluation of performance. On the basis of this information, the panel should not seek to rank each clerical against the others but rather to classify them into four (or at most five) groups, which should be a standard nomenclature utilized by all five Career Services:

~~ADMINISTRATIVE~~**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**ADMINISTRATIVE****INTERNAL USE ONLY**

- (a) those meriting immediate consideration for promotion or assignment to a position carrying a promotion.
- (b) those who may be considered now for promotion but would benefit from further development effort first.
- (c) those who are performing satisfactorily but do not merit promotion.
- (d) those whose performance requires improvement in specified respects in order to be termed satisfactory.

When a vacancy opens up or a reassignment is to be considered, the panel would be responsible for submitting the names of qualified eligibles to the selecting/promoting authority.

10. As a practical matter, it would be well to exclude from panel evaluation those clericals who are in the grades of GS-05 and below (the attrition rates are upward of 25%) with the exception of those who have been with the Agency a minimum of three years.\* Those excluded from panel review would be evaluated by their supervisors, who would make the appropriate recommendations to the panels for promotion, training, and reassignment. The excluded clericals should have full access to the regular counseling mechanism.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

\* Establish within the Career Services or in their Sub-Groups panels to evaluate clerical personnel in grades GS-06 and up and those personnel in lower grades who have been with the Agency three years or more. The objectives of the panels will be to establish the eligibility of those employees under their purview for promotion, reassignment, and training. (Action: Career Services)

\* The Career Services should develop uniform procedures for the classification of clerical employees of similar grade and occupation into four groups affecting eligibility for promotion or assignment to a position carrying a promotion. (Action: Career Services and OP)

\* The objective of identifying the lowest ranking employees will be satisfied in the case of clerical employees by the procedure of identifying those whose performance requires improvement in specified respects in order to be termed satisfactory. (Action: Career Services)

11. Assignment, training and career development. A useful starting point for discussion concerning career development is the Annual Assignment Preference Form currently employed in the E Career Service. This

\* This may reduce the evaluation burden by as much as 40%.

**ADMINISTRATIVE**  
**INTERNAL<sup>5</sup> USE ONLY**

~~ADMINISTRATIVE~~  
**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

form provides a sanctioned means for the employee to indicate a desire for reassignment or training. It provides a useful input both to the supervisor and to the panel, although there will be a justifiable fear that a supervisor would react unsympathetically to an expressed desire for reassignment. The panel should consider carefully any training request and should let the employee know if he might be qualified and eligible for a desired reassignment. These considerations are useful inputs for the PDP, which will now cover GS-09s and up, and for upward mobility planning.

12. Panels evaluating senior secretaries and clericals should keep in close touch with the internal market for semi-professionals and professionals so that their qualified people might be considered for vacancies permitting career upgrading. The potential for this coordination is one of the most important reasons for retaining jurisdiction over clericals in the existing Career Services. In addition, the panels should be prepared to recommend training and educational plans to support such upgrading.

13. There will be a need for some reassignments where the employee is not eligible for promotion but where considerations of personal relationships, the nature of the current job, or health indicate the advisability of a lateral transfer or a reassignment to a lower graded job. Such considerations are not precluded from the purview of the panels and would establish eligibility for reassignment.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

\* The Career Services should make use of the Annual Assignment Preference Form for clericals. (Action: Career Services)

\* The Career Services should coordinate panel actions to facilitate the flow of qualified clerical personnel into semi-professional and professional positions. (Action: Career Services)

\* The panels should play an active role in making recommendations for reassignment and for training. (Action: Career Services)

14. Counseling. Clerical personnel have extensive needs for career-related counseling. In many offices, this load is carried by the CMO. With the institution of panels to oversee the clerical employees, this counseling load may be distributed by designating selected panel members as counselors. They should be provided appropriate training, such as the counseling course now being prepared by OTR.

15. Clerical Utilization. Questions dealing with the proper utilization of clerical resources are appropriate subject matter for the consideration of Senior Personnel Resource Boards. They should assign priority to studies of ways in which to make more effective use of clerical personnel and to make their work more attractive. The exchange

~~ADMINISTRATIVE~~  
**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

ADMINISTRATIVE

**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

of experience among Career Services would be helpful and would encourage constructive experimentation. The concept of the establishment of Word Processing/Administrative Support Groups offers some promise provided it does not lead to overspecialization of an assembly-line type of orientation. It may be possible to make more use of part-time secretaries and clericals where offices must staff to meet peak load requirements or where needs are greater during certain parts of the day.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

\* The Career Services should assign priority to studies of ways to make more effective use of clerical personnel in consonance with the heavy capital investment made in support of typing, filing, and document reproduction and to make clerical work more satisfying to the employees. (Action: Career Services)

\* Designate selected panel members as career counselors.  
(Action: Career Services)

ADMINISTRATIVE  
**INTERNAL USE ONLY**

EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR SENIOR SECRETARIES

1. Proposal: The Deputy Director for Operations has recommended that the Agency abandon its practice of establishing secretarial grades on the general basis of the grade of the supervisor and substitute a system under which the actual duties and responsibilities of the secretarial positions will be evaluated.

2. Background Data: The secretarial pattern system in the Agency was established in 1957 as a means of simplifying the grading process and achieving what was regarded as a more equitable system for establishing grades. It was not intended as a PMCD "bye" as suggested by the DD/O but rather as a system under which the organizational level of the supervisor's position was recognized as having an effect on the secretarial grade resulting from the differences in level of contacts and responsibilities which applied to the secretary job. Previously for many years positions had been classified according to difficulty and responsibility. Under this system office heads were unwilling to accept the determination that their secretaries were not fully equal to those of other office heads of the same rank regardless of the evaluation of responsibilities of the secretarial position. Repeated reviews of secretarial positions were requested by office heads when grade increases were denied. Traditionally, office heads and other supervisory officials consider that their rank entitles them to a secretary whose grade is equal to that of all other officers at the same level. This feeling applies throughout all components and at nearly all organizational levels as well as throughout the Federal Government and throughout industry. It has been recognized in many evaluation systems for secretaries that organizational level has a significant effect on the grade level. The result is that most officials at a particular level and at comparable locations in the organizational hierarchy have secretarial positions at approximately the same grade level, in this Agency, in other agencies and in industry.

The DD/O's paper says on the one hand that an evaluation system based on merit should be established. On the other hand it says that levels should be raised to equal those established in the Foreign Service without regard for evaluation on the merits. It further proposes that certain grades should be raised to compare with certain higher grades in the Department of Justice which are based on evaluation of functions and responsibilities completely dissimilar from those of Agency positions.

With regard to the factual details submitted by the DD/O:

a. The statistical information on Foreign Service jobs which the DD/O has compiled is accepted as reasonably correct and has not been checked in detail. We agree that in all Agency overseas locations we may have only nine positions graded higher than GS-08 while the Foreign Service has approximately 224 graded above GS-08 in the same locations. We agree further that we have no positions overseas above GS-09 while the Foreign Service has positions totaling approximately 60 which are as high as the equivalent of GS-12.

b. We recognize that there are other support specialists such as Logistics Assistants, GS-09; Supply Assistant, GS-09; Procurement Assistant, GS-10; Records Supervisor, GS-10 and Information Control Specialist, GS-11 while probably 80% of the secretaries do not go beyond GS-07 and 99% do not go beyond GS-09.

c. Throughout the Federal Government standards established by the Civil Service Commission are utilized to classify secretarial positions. Under these standards it is true that the Department of Justice has GS-08 secretaries for GS-16 officers who are section chiefs in the Department divisions. Further they have GS-09 positions for secretaries to the Deputy Assistant Attorney Generals who are at GS-17. The Assistant Attorney Generals who are Executive Level 04 have GS-10 secretaries. Executive Level 03, the Solicitor General, has a GS-11; Executive Level 02, Deputy Attorney General, has a GS-12 and the Executive Level 01, the Attorney General, has a GS-12 and also has a Confidential Assistant at the GS-14 level which appears to be essentially secretarial in nature but is not currently filled and may not be filled at all. The Department of Justice has a grade structure for secretaries which is generally higher than that of other agencies because of the recognized difficulty of legal secretarial positions and the substantially higher salaries of such positions in private industry in comparison to other secretarial positions. The grade structure of the Department of Justice is apparently higher than the Agency only at the GS-08 and GS-09 levels. These grade levels are fully justified under the standards established by the Civil Service Commission based on the essential difficulty of legal secretarial work. We agree with the DD/O that Agency secretarial grades could not be so justified.

3. Staff Position: Whether or not the Agency practice of classifying secretarial positions is discriminatory is a matter of subjective judgment which cannot be conclusively established. It depends on the extent to which so called "grade attraction" principles affect secretarial positions. Grade attraction and organizational level of supervisor positions are recognized factors which affect the grades of secretarial positions. The Deputy Director for Operations apparently recognizes this since he wishes to elevate the grade structure to be closer to that of the Foreign Service which is now strictly an organizational level classification system. The system does, however, limit the determination of grade to only one aspect of the position without a detailed review of other factors. For many years the current pattern system has been accepted without serious objection by top officials as a simple means of determining appropriate grades. If a system based on strict evaluation on the merits of the positions were established similar to that used before the pattern system was adopted, it is likely that there would be some downgradings of positions and possibly a few upgradings. There would not be any substantial upgrading of levels as the Deputy Director for Operations appears to anticipate. There would be no general upgrading above GS-07 in comparison with the Department of Justice (the only headquarters comparison that the DD/O cites) and any upgrading based on the Foreign Service would not have anything to do with merit.

It should be noted also that the evaluation of Foreign Service positions in comparison to General Schedule positions is a matter now under review by the Civil Service Commission and the State Department to establish a more equitable relationship. It should be further noted that the levels of secretaries in the Foreign Service were originally established without regard to merit and without any sort of evaluation during the period of several years when the State Department abolished its classification system. For the last few years the State Department has been attempting to bring some order out of the chaos which resulted from the completely indiscriminate establishment of levels based entirely on what operating components wished to establish. The unfortunate aspect of the problem is that once excessively high levels are established, it is difficult to take any corrective measures without serious effect on employee morale and such inequitable levels will inevitably be used for comparison by other agencies.

With regard to the positions of Logistics Assistant, Supply Assistant, etc. at levels which are higher than a substantial number of secretarial positions, there is no logical comparison that can be made which would support higher grades

for secretaries. The functions of these support specialists are based on an evaluation of their responsibilities. There is no relationship between the levels of these positions and the levels of secretaries.

With regard to the requirements for speed, accuracy, tact, style and selflessness which are cited as factors which should be rated on their merits, we do not question this principle, but it is not apparent that rating on the merits would result in any grades above GS-07.

With regard to the Civil Service Commission's statement that secretarial positions which have duties and responsibilities of a non-secretarial nature of a higher level, should be classified at the higher level, we do not question this and in cases where such duties and responsibilities have been discovered positions have been classified as something other than secretary and at a higher level.

We are in agreement with the belief of the DD/O that an attempt should be made to grant recognition, a fair wage and an opportunity to achieve for secretarial employees. We disagree, however, that this should be accomplished by a general upgrading of senior secretarial levels above GS-07 and we do not believe that such upgrading is supported by any reasonable comparison or by any evaluation on the merits. Obviously where secretaries have skills and abilities or potential for advancement to higher grade levels that are not recognized in secretarial positions established at reasonable pay levels based on the difficulty and responsibility of the work, they should be permitted to progress into professional or administrative fields where higher pay levels can legitimately be recognized on the basis of merit.

4. Recommendation: In order to insure that full recognition is given to the merit principle, we recommend therefore:

a. That the Agency secretarial pattern system which establishes secretarial grades on the basis of the organizational level and grade of the supervisor's position be continued as a guide in determining pay levels for secretaries.

b. That an evaluation of secretarial positions be made in all cases to determine if there is a basis for a grade higher than the pattern, based on merit, and, if so, that such grade be approved. It should be recognized that whenever a position is upgraded because of higher level duties and the secretary is promoted, she would be subject to downgrading upon reassignment to a position not having the higher duties.

Status Report on Agency Adherence to the "Federal Executive Agency Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures"

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a current report on the Agency's adherence to the "Federal Executive Agency Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures".

2. Much has been written concerning the "Guidelines" since they were originally published in November 1976. Representatives from this office have attended numerous meetings at the Commission in order to keep current on this subject and to assure ourselves that the Agency is in accord with the provisions of this document.

3. The "Guidelines" have recently (October 1977) been revised. The critical feature of the document was and still remains whether or not an Agency is subject to "adverse action" based primarily on its adherence to the so-called "four-fifths rule". Adverse Action is evident when the selection rate for one group (usually women, blacks, Hispanics) is less than eighty percent (80%) of the rate for the group with the highest selection rate (usually whites).

4. We have completed studies in two of the areas designated, Promotions and Training. Additional work is underway in the area of Recruiting and Hiring. The remaining subject areas to be studied are: Retention,

*Administrative - Internal Use Only*

Rankings, Demotions, and Performance Appraisal. Attached is the summary of the promotion rates for FY 1977.

5. In the Agency's promotion rates we find some interesting reversals. Using the "four-fifths rule" for determining adverse action, we find that the promotion rate for whites is only sixty percent (60%) of that for blacks - the highest selection rate. The rate for white males is 52.8% of that for black males, falling considerably below the required figure. Overall, the promotion rate for blacks, women and Hispanics is higher than the rates for whites.

Granted, while the promotion rate for whites overall and white males in particular fall below the desired percentage, we can look at the Agency promotion rate (20%) and conclude that the white and white male promotion rate is consistent with that average.

6. The following promotion rates utilizing the four-fifths rule are presented for comparison:

- a) White males - 52.8% of Black Male Selection Rate
- b) Males - 66.2% of Female Selection Rate
- c) White females - 80.2% of Black Male Selection Rate
- d) Whites - 60% of Black Selection Rate
- e) Black females - 74.6 of Hispanic Female Selection Rate

Administrative - Internal Use Only

7. The basic question as to whether or not the Agency is promoting minorities and women at a rate which would subject us to adverse action by one of these groups is fairly simple to answer. We are not only in accordance with the "Guidelines", but in most cases, far exceed the required rate for promotion of our female and minority professional personnel.

8. In the area of training, it is necessary for us to consider only the comparison between males and females, since the Office of Training does not maintain statistics on Blacks or Hispanics.

We chose two OTR Courses of Instruction, the "Fundamentals of Supervision and Management" (FSM) and the "Managerial Grid", to determine whether or not the selection rate for females was in accord with the "Guidelines". These courses are primarily for first-line supervisors, and the students are nominated by their respective office, not selected by the Office of Training.

In order to arrive at a fair comparison in the area of training, we compared the total number of each group eligible for selection, to the percentages enrolled in the courses.

9. There are  professional female employees in the Agency, compared to  male professionals. This represents 16.8 percent of female professionals in the workforce. Based on those percentages, the female enrollment in these two courses surpass their agency population ratio.

Administrative - Limited Use Only

<u>Course</u>	<u>Total Enrollment</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>% of Females</u>
FSM	245	181	64	26.1
GRID	224	164	60	26.7

10. It is interesting to examine the statistics on the selection rates for the Senior War Colleges, school year 1977-78. This includes the National, Naval, Army and Air War Colleges, in addition to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the Executive Seminar at State Department. There were a total of twenty-two Agency officers nominated for these programs - 20 men and 2 women. Twelve were selected, 10 men and 2 women. This would make the selection rate for females 100 percent and the selection rate for males 50 percent. Since the selection rate for males falls 30% short of the rate suggested by the "Guidelines", we would have to conclude that the males were discriminated against in this process. This obviously is not the case, but is shown to point out that females are considered without "adverse action" at all levels in the training selection process.

11. Some of the other areas for study (Retention, Demotion, Rankings, etc), will be much more complex. However, they will be undertaken in the months ahead. It is safe to state at this point, based upon evidence, that the Agency's policies on Promotions and Training Selection are clearly in conformance with the provisions of the "Guidelines".

STATINTEL

7 Dec. 1977

Administrative - Internal Use Only

**Page Denied**

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

I. (g) Visibility to projected percentage opportunity

The meaning and context of this phrase are not clear.

Some of the APP goals could be reported to employees in terms that protect security; some Directorates already publish a sanitized version of their affirmative action plans.

I. (h) Up and Out policy statement

Adverse experiences with employees and court action have caused State Department to water down its up and out policy by extending time-in-grade limits so that no one is caught. We question the appropriateness of such a policy ("up and out") for specialist occupational classes where the employees rise to the journeyman level and then, without further promotion, continue to provide valuable services. The personnel evaluation system in place provides the mechanism to catch the individual who is not performing or is just coasting.

Recommend this one not be studied in EAG. Should be monitored in their own Career Service.

12. We need to consider an "up-or-out" policy under which middle-level grades, say GS-11 to GS-14, would leave early if not promoted in a certain length of time.

The Department of State has followed an "up-or-out" policy for many years. The suicide in 1973 of a Foreign Service Officer (FSO Lindsay) terminated under the policy and subsequent court and union litigation forced suspension of the policy's application until about two years ago.

The policy has been reactivated in principle but the permissible time in grade periods have been extended to such an extent that few if any separations under the policy are being made.

Under the earlier policy State experienced mixed results and lost many excellent fast track younger officers who were promoted early in their careers but encountered headroom blockages at higher grades that forced their retention in grade beyond permissible time in grade limits resulting in termination. The impact of an "up-or-out" policy <sup>WITHIN</sup> written the Agency would be seriously damaging to effectively meeting the day to day and year to year requirements of the Agency which are efficiently handled by fully competent personnel -often specialists- who are "Valuable contributors" yet have leveled out at certain grades and are neither

aspiring nor in competition for higher level responsibilities. In effect, the ability of the Agency to meet its requirements is heavily dependent on retention of this large element of the work force.

Finally, there are legal questions relative to CIA's adoption of such a policy (particularly if discriminated by selected grade levels) which should be explored by OGC.

13. In recognition of growing lack of headroom and opportunity in senior grades (GS-15 to GS-18), we need to rank current incumbents of these grades, and develop criteria for seeking early retirement or other such solutions to the headroom problem.

Recommend that the headroom situation be addressed at the next EAG meeting with the Deputy Directors identifying the existence of any specific problems that they are encountering or anticipate within their Directorate.

Discussion of ranking current GS-15 through GS-18 officers and the development of criteria or considerations relative to encouraging early retirement where appropriate should also be covered.

14. Having agreed in EAG on the 38 jobs we identified as key assignments to be made on Agency-wide considerations, how can we insure that a process to accomplish this is in train?

Procedures have been developed and Directorates have provided the additional